

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 18, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53, 57, and 61-65 are currently amended. Claims 9-10, 17, 20, 24-25, 32, 37, 41, 54-56, and 58 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 7, 23, and 31 are canceled herein without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 8, 11-16, 18-19, 21-22, 26-30, 33-36, 38-40, 42-53, 57, and 59-65 are currently pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-8, 18-19, 21-23, 34-36, 42-43, 46-49, 52-53, 57, 60-63, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,459) in view of *Rogers* (U.S. Patent No. 4,404,685), *Oczak* (NPL: "Navigation and Communication Systems", Fall 2000) and *Whikehart et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,200,377). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 is directed to a radio receiver, and now recites in part:

a front-end circuit operable to receive a plurality of radio signals, transmitted across a frequency band, ... said front-end circuit comprising an intermediate frequency mixing circuit operable to translate the received radio signals to an intermediate frequency band *and a filter circuit operable to filter the received radio signals, said filter circuit comprising a notch filter; ...*

Independent claims 18 and 43 are also amended to include the limitation of a "*filter circuit operable to filter the received radio signals, said filter circuit comprising a notch filter.*" Similarly, independent claims 34 and 57 now recite a "*filter circuit comprising a notch filter tuned to remove an interfering signal from the received radio signals.*" In addition, independent claims 46 and 53 now recite a "*filter circuit operable to filter the received radio signals, said filter circuit comprising a notch filter tuned to remove an interfering signal from the received radio signals.*"

Support for these added limitations can be found in the application as filed on page 7, lines 22-25, and page 8, lines 19-23.

Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references, either alone or in combination, of all the limitations now recited in claims 1, 18, 34, 43, 46, 53, and 57. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, *Oczak*, or *Whikehart* of a “*filter circuit comprising a notch filter*” as recited in these claims.

Thus, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of these claims are met.

Accordingly, claims 1, 18, 34, 43, 46, 53, and 57 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Since claims 4-8 and 60 depend from claim 1, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 1. Since claims 19 and 21-23 depend from claim 18, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 18. Since claims 35, 36, and 42 depend from claim 34, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 34. Since claims 47-49, 52, 61-63, and 65 depend from claim 46, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 46.

As a result, the foregoing dependent claims would also not have been obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 4-8, 18-19, 21-23, 34-36, 42-43, 46-49, 52-53, 57, 60-63, and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 14-15, 27, 44-45, and 50-51 were rejected under under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski* in view of *Rogers*, *Oczak*, and *Whikehart*, and further in view of *Phillips* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,878). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 2-3 and 14-15 depend from claim 1, and thus include the limitations of claim 1. Claim 27 depends from independent claim 18 and thus includes the limitations of claim 18. Claims 44-45 depend from independent claim 43 and thus include the limitations of claim 43. Claims 50-51 depend from independent claim 46 and thus include the limitations of claim 46.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, *Oczak*, or *Whikehart* of a “filter circuit comprising a notch filter” as recited in claims 1, 18, 43, and 46. The addition of the teachings of *Phillips* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

As a result, even if the teaching of the cited reference are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claims 2-3, 14-15, 27, 44-45, and 50-51 are met. Thus, these claims would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-3, 14-15, 27, 44-45, and 50-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 11-13 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski* in view of *Rogers*, *Oczak*, and *Whikehart*, and further in view of *Bugeja* et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0177446). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 11-13 depend from claim 1 and thus include the limitations of claim 1. Claim 26 depends from independent claim 18 and thus includes the limitations of claim 18.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, *Oczak*, or *Whikehart* of a “filter circuit comprising a notch filter” as recited in claims 1 and 18. The addition of the teachings of *Bugeja* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

As a result, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claims 11-13 and 26 are met. Thus, these claims would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-13 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski* in view of *Rogers*, *Oczak*, *Whikehart*, *Phillips*, and further in view of *Bugeja*. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 16 depends from claim 1 and thus includes the limitations of claim 1.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, *Oczak*, or *Whikehart* of a “filter circuit comprising a notch filter” as recited in claim 1. The addition of the teachings of *Phillips* and *Bugeja* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

As a result, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claim 16 are met. Thus, claim 16 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 38-40 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski* in view of *Rogers*, *Oczak*, *Whikehart*, *Bugeja*, and further in view of *Phillips*. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 38-40 depend from independent claim 34, and thus include the limitations of claim 34. Claim 59 depends from independent claim 57 and thus includes the limitations of claim 57.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, *Oczak*, or *Whikehart* of a “filter circuit comprising a notch filter” as recited in claims 34 and 57. The addition of the teachings of *Bugeja* and *Phillips* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

As a result, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claims 38-40 and 59 are met. Thus, claims 38-40 and 59 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 38-40 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 18-19, 21-23, 27-31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kelley* (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,402) in view of *Rogers*, *Oczak*, and *Kelley et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,280,636). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Like independent claim 18, independent claim 29 now recites a “*filter circuit operable to filter the received radio signals, said filter circuit comprising a notch filter.*”

Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references, either alone or in combination, of all the limitations now recited in claims 18 and 29. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kelley* ‘402, *Rogers*, *Oczak*, or *Kelley* ‘636 of a “*filter circuit operable to filter the received radio signals, said filter circuit comprising a notch filter*” as recited in claims 18 and 29.

Thus, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claims 18 and 29 are met. As a result, claims 18 and 29 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Since claims 19, 21-23, and 27-28 depend from claim 18, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 18. Since claims 30-31 and 33 depend from claim 29, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 29. As a result, the foregoing dependent claims would also not have been obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 18 and 29.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 18-19, 21-23, 27-31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 64 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaminski in view of Rogers, Oczak, Whikehart, and further in view of *Chelton* (NPL: “Series III Avionics Pilot’s Guide”, 2000). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 64 depends from independent claim 46 and thus includes the limitations of claim 46.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, *Oczak*, or *Whikehart* of a “*filter circuit comprising a notch filter*” as recited in claim 46. The addition of the teachings of *Chelton* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

As a result, even if the teaching of the cited reference are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claim 64 are met. Thus, claim 64 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/616,796

Filing Date: 7/10/2003

Attorney Docket No. H0004400-5602

Title: RADIO RECEIVER

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 20, 2010

/GREGORY M. TAYLOR/

Gregory M. Taylor
Reg. No. 34,263

Attorneys for Applicants
Fogg & Powers LLC
5810 W. 78th Street, Ste. 100
Minneapolis, MN 55439
T – (952) 465-0770
F – (952) 465-0771